

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/773,000	10/773,000 , 02/05/2004		Anup Sood	PB0313	5599		
22840	7590	07/07/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
GE HEAL	ГНСАІ	RE BIO-SCIENCE	POHNERT,	POHNERT, STEVEN C			
PATENT D	<b>EPART</b>	MENT					
800 CENTE	NNIAL	AVENUE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
PISCATAW	/AΥ, Ν	J 08855	1634	1634			

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-		Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/773,000		SOOD ET AL.				
Office Action	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Steven C. Po	ohnert	1634				
The MAILING DAT	E of this communication ap	ppears on the c	over sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
- ·		LVIC CET TO	CYDIDE 4 MONTH/	e) OD TUIDTV (3	0) DAV6			
WHICHEVER IS LONGE - Extensions of time may be availa after SIX (6) MONTHS from the n - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set or e	TORY PERIOD FOR REPL R, FROM THE MAILING In the under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. In all ing date of this communication. Above, the maximum statutory period extended period for reply will, by staturater than three months after the mail in See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS 1.136(a). In no event, d will apply and will e ute, cause the applica	COMMUNICATION however, may a reply be tim xpire SIX (6) MONTHS from tion to become ABANDONEI	<b>I.</b> lely filed the mailing date of this ⇔ D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) Responsive to com	munication(s) filed on 25 I	February 2004		•				
2a) This action is FINA	· —							
3) Since this application	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is							
closed in accordan	ce with the practice under	Ex parte Quay	/le, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	33 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	C							
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are	e pending in the application	n.						
,	aim(s) is/are withdra		ideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/a	are allowed.							
6) Claim(s) is/a	are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/a								
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-62</u> are s	subject to restriction and/or	r election requi	rement.					
Application Papers	·							
9) The specification is	objected to by the Examin	ner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed	l on is/are: a)□ ac	ccepted or b)	objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not re	quest that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be	held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
•	g sheet(s) including the corre							
11)☐ The oath or declara	tion is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note	the attached Office	Action or form P	ГО-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19	•						
12) Acknowledgment is	made of a claim for foreig	gn priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some	* c)☐ None of:							
•	ies of the priority documer							
<del></del>	ies of the priority documer				04			
· ·	e certified copies of the pri			ed in this National	Stage			
• •	rom the International Bureatians tailed Office action for a lis	-		· ed				
Gee the attached de	tailed Office action for a lis	or or the defanc	a dopies necrosore					
Attachment(s)			» 🗖	(070, 440)				
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (F</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Pate</li> </ol>	PTO-892) ent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4	Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
	ment(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0			atent Application (PT	O-152)			

C

Application/Control Number: 10/773,000 Page 2

Art Unit: 1634

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-56, are drawn to a method of sequencing nucleic acids, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
  - II. Claim 57-62, are drawn to a nucleic acid sequence detection kit, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the process of sequencing nucleic acids can be done by the Sanger or Maxam-Gilbert methods, which does not require the use of a polyphosphate label. The product and process claimed are distinct as the process claimed can be practiced with a materially different product. Searching the art for methods of sequencing nucleic would not necessarily, produce art on kits for sequencing and vice versa. The search of each group presents a serious search burden as the searches for each is not coextensive.

Application/Control Number: 10/773,000

Art Unit: 1634

3. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

(

- 4. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. A telephone call was made to Stephen Ryan on June 20, 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions

Application/Control Number: 10/773,000

Art Unit: 1634

unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven C. Pohnert whose telephone number is 571-272-3803. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-4:00.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/773,000

Art Unit: 1634

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Steven Pohnert

fall

JEHANNE SITTON PRIMARY EXAMINER

(